
SPHERICAL GRADIENT MANIFOLDS

by

Christian Miebach & Henrik Stötzl

Abstract. — We study the action of a real-reductive group $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ on real-analytic submanifold X of a Kähler manifold Z . We suppose that the action of G extends holomorphically to an action of the complexified group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the action of a maximal Hamiltonian subgroup is Hamiltonian. The moment map μ induces a gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$. We show that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits if and only if a minimal parabolic subgroup of G has an open orbit. This generalizes Brion's characterization of spherical Kähler manifolds with moment maps.

Résumé. — Nous étudions l'action d'un groupe réel-réductif $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ sur une sous-variété réel-analytique X d'une variété kählérienne Z . Nous supposons que l'action de G peut être prolongée à une action holomorphe du groupe complexifié $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ telle que l'action d'un sous-groupe maximal compact de $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ soit hamiltonienne. L'application moment μ induit une application gradient $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$. Nous montrons que $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ sépare les orbites de K si et seulement si un sous-groupe minimal parabolique de G possède une orbite ouverte dans X . Ce résultat généralise la caractérisation de Brion des variétés kählériennes sphériques qui admettent une application moment.

1. Introduction

Let $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ be a complex-reductive Lie group with compact real form U and let Z be a Kähler manifold on which $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts holomorphically such that U acts by Kähler isometries. Assume furthermore that the U -action on Z is Hamiltonian, i. e. that there exists a U -equivariant moment map $\mu : Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$ where $\mathfrak{u}$ denotes the Lie algebra of U .

In the special case that Z is compact it is shown in [Bri87] (see also [HW90]) that μ separates the U -orbits if and only if Z is a spherical $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -manifold, which means that a Borel subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ has an open orbit in Z . Note that μ separates the U -orbits if and only if it induces an injective map $Z/U \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{u}/U$. Moreover, this is equivalent to the property that the U -action on Z is coisotropic.

In this paper we generalize Brion's result to actions of real-reductive groups on real-analytic manifolds which moreover are not assumed to be compact. More precisely, we consider a closed subgroup G of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ which is compatible with the Cartan decomposition $U^{\mathbb{C}} = U \exp(i\mathfrak{u})$. This means that $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ where $K := G \cap U$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ is an $\text{Ad}(K)$ -invariant subspace of

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. — 32M05 (22E46, 53D20).

The authors would like to thank Peter Heinzner for many useful discussions. The first author thanks the Fakultät für Mathematik of the Ruhr-Universität Bochum for its hospitality.

iu. Let X be a G -invariant real-analytic submanifold of Z . By restriction, the moment map μ induces a K -equivariant gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow (\mathfrak{ip})^*$.

There are two main differences between the complex and the real situation: Even if X is connected an open G -orbit in X does not have to be dense and in general the fibers of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are not connected. Therefore one cannot expect $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to separate the K -orbits globally in X . We say that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits if there exists a K -invariant open subset Ω of X such that $K \cdot x$ is open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Geometrically this means that the induced map $\Omega/K \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ has discrete fibers. If $\Omega = X$, we say that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits in X .

We suppose throughout this article that X/G is connected. Now we can state our main result.

Theorem 1. — *The following are equivalent.*

1. *The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits.*
2. *The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits in X .*
3. *The minimal parabolic subgroup Q_0 of G has an open orbit in X .*

Hence, Theorem 1 gives a sufficient condition on the G -action for $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to induce a map $X/K \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ whose fibers are discrete, while on the other hand the gradient map yields a criterion for X to be spherical. Moreover we see that sphericity is independent of the particular choice of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$, i. e. if one gradient map for the G -action on X generically separates the K -orbits in X , then this is true for every gradient map.

Let us outline the main ideas of the proof. First we observe that X contains an open Q_0 -orbit if and only if $(G/Q_0) \times X$ contains an open G -orbit with respect to the diagonal action of G . The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on X induces a gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on $(G/Q_0) \times X$. Now we are in a situation where we can apply the methods introduced in [HS07b]. These allow us to show that open G -orbits correspond to isolated minimal K -orbits of the norm squared of $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. In order to relate the property that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits to the existence of an isolated minimal K -orbit, we need the following result. We consider the restriction $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}|_{K \cdot x}: K \cdot x \rightarrow K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ which is a smooth fiber bundle with fiber $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x$. In the special case $G = K^{\mathbb{C}}$ it is proven in [GS84] that for generic x the fiber $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x$ is a torus. As a generalization we prove the following proposition, which also allows us to extend the notion of “ K -spherical” defined in [HW90] to actions of real-reductive groups.

Proposition 2. — *Let $x \in X$ be generic and choose a maximal Abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ containing $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$. Then the orbits of the centralizer $\mathcal{Z}_K(\mathfrak{a})$ of $\mathfrak{a}$ in K are open in $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x$.*

These arguments yield the existence of an open Q_0 -orbit under the assumption that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. For the other direction we apply the shifting technique for gradient maps.

Notice that our proof of Brion’s theorem is different from the ones in [Bri87] and [HW90]. In particular, for every generic element $x \in X$ we construct a minimal parabolic subgroup Q_0 of G such that $Q_0 \cdot x$ is open in X .

At present we do not know whether a spherical G -gradient manifold does only contain a finite number of G - and Q_0 -orbits (which is true in the complex-algebraic situation). These and other natural open questions will be addressed in future works.

2. Gradient manifolds

In this section we review the necessary background on G -gradient manifolds and gradient maps. We then define what it means that a gradient map locally almost separates the orbits

of a maximal compact subgroup of G and discuss several examples where this can be shown to be true.

2.1. The gradient map. — Here we recall the definition of the gradient map. For a detailed discussion we refer the reader to [HS07b].

Let U be a compact Lie group and $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ its universal complexification (see [Ho65]). We assume that Z is a Kähler manifold with a holomorphic action of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the Kähler form is invariant under the action of the compact real form U of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$. We assume furthermore that the action of U is Hamiltonian, i. e. that there exists a moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$, where $\mathfrak{u}^*$ is the dual of the Lie algebra of U . We require μ to be real-analytic and U -equivariant, where the action of U on $\mathfrak{u}^*$ is the coadjoint action.

The complex reductive group $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ admits a Cartan involution $\theta: U^{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow U^{\mathbb{C}}$ with fixed point set U . The -1 -eigenspace of the induced Lie algebra involution equals $\mathfrak{iu}$. We have an induced Cartan decomposition, i. e. the map $U \times \mathfrak{iu} \rightarrow U^{\mathbb{C}}$, $(u, \xi) \mapsto u \exp(\xi)$ is a diffeomorphism. Let G be a θ -stable closed real subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ with only finitely many connected components. Equivalently, we assume that G is a closed subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$, such that the Cartan decomposition restricts to a diffeomorphism $K \times \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow G$, where $K := G \cap U$ and $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{iu}$. In this paper such a group $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ is called *real-reductive*. Note that $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ itself is an example for such a subgroup G of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Let X be a G -invariant real-analytic submanifold of Z such that X/G is connected. We identify $\mathfrak{u}$ with $\mathfrak{u}^*$ by a U -invariant inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{u}$. Moreover we identify $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{iu}$ by multiplication with i . Then the moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$ restricts to a real-analytic map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ which is defined by $\langle \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), \xi \rangle = \mu(x)(-i\xi)$ for $\xi \in \mathfrak{p}$. We call $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ a *G -gradient map on X* and we say that X is a *G -gradient manifold*. Note that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is K -equivariant with respect to the adjoint action of K on $\mathfrak{p}$. In the special case $G = U^{\mathbb{C}}$, the gradient map coincides with the moment map up to the identification of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ with $\mathfrak{iu}$.

In this paper, we consider real-analytic gradient maps which *locally almost separate the K -orbits*. By this, we mean that there exists a K -invariant open subset Ω of X such that the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.

1. $K \cdot x$ is open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$ for all $x \in \Omega$.
2. $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} \cdot x$ is open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$ for all $x \in \Omega$.
3. The induced map $\overline{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: \Omega/K \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ has discrete fibers.

If $\Omega = X$, we say that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ *almost separates the K -orbits*. We will show later that the set Ω on which $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits can always be chosen to be X , i. e. $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ separates locally almost the K -orbits if and only if $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates them. If $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) = K \cdot x$ for all $x \in X$, then we say that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ *globally separates the K -orbits*.

Lemma 2.1. — *Suppose that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. Then G has an open orbit in X .*

Proof. — By assumption there exists a K -invariant open subset $\Omega \subset X$ such that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))^0 \subset K \cdot x$ holds for all $x \in \Omega$. Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is real-analytic, we find a point $x \in \Omega$ such that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has maximal rank in x . We conclude from Lemma 5.1 in [HS07b] that $(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} = T_x \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) \subset \mathfrak{k} \cdot x$ and thus obtain

$$T_x X = (\mathfrak{p} \cdot x) \oplus (\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} \subset (\mathfrak{p} \cdot x) + (\mathfrak{k} \cdot x) = \mathfrak{g} \cdot x,$$

which means that $G \cdot x$ is open in X . □

2.2. Examples. — In general, it is very difficult to verify directly that a G -gradient map separates (locally almost) the K -orbits. In this subsection we give some examples of situations where this can be done.

Example. — The connected group $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ acts on itself by left multiplication. The standard gradient map for this action is given by $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(k \exp(\xi)) = \text{Ad}(k)\xi$. Let $x_0 = k_0 \exp(\xi_0) \in G$ be given. One checks directly that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)) = x_0 K$. Hence, $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits if and only if there exists a K -invariant open subset $\Omega \subset G$ such that $xK = Kx$ for all $x \in \Omega$. We claim that this is the case if and only if $\mathfrak{p}^K = \mathfrak{p}$.

Suppose that $xK = Kx$ holds for all x in a K -invariant open subset $\Omega \subset G$. This means that the fixed point set $(G/K)^K$ has non-empty interior. Since G/K is K -equivariantly diffeomorphic to $\mathfrak{p}$ with the adjoint K -action, we see that $\mathfrak{p}^K$ has non-empty interior and thus $\mathfrak{p}^K = \mathfrak{p}$.

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{p}^K = \mathfrak{p}$, then we have for every $x = k \exp(\xi) \in G$ that $Kx = K \exp(\xi) = \exp(\xi)K = xK$ holds.

Example. — We describe a class of totally real G -gradient manifolds where $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits.

Let (Z, ω) be a Kähler manifold endowed with a holomorphic $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action such that the U -action is Hamiltonian with moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$. Suppose that the action is defined over $\mathbb{R}$ in the following sense. There exists an antiholomorphic involutive automorphism $\sigma: U^{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow U^{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\sigma\theta = \theta\sigma$ and there is an antiholomorphic involution $\tau: Z \rightarrow Z$ with $\tau^*\omega = -\omega$ and $\tau(g \cdot z) = \sigma(g) \cdot \tau(z)$ for all $g \in U^{\mathbb{C}}$ and all $z \in Z$. Consequently, the fixed point set $X := Z^{\tau}$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of Z and the compatible real form $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p}) = (U^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma}$ acts on X . Let $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ be the K -equivariant gradient map induced by μ .

We claim that if μ locally almost separates the U -orbits in Z , then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits in X . This claim is a consequence of the following three observations:

1. If μ locally almost separates the U -orbits, then μ separates all the U -orbits in Z (see [HW90]).
2. Since X is Lagrangian, we see that $\mu_{\mathfrak{k}}|_X \equiv 0$, where $\mu_{\mathfrak{k}}$ denotes the moment map for the K -action on Z . Note that under our identification we have $\mu = \mu_{\mathfrak{k}} + \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$.
3. For every $x \in X$ the orbit $K \cdot x$ is open in $(U \cdot x) \cap X$.

Locally injective gradient maps separate locally almost the K -orbits. A class of G -gradient manifolds for which $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is locally injective is described in the following example.

Example. — Let $Z = U/K$ be a Hermitian symmetric space of the compact type, and let $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ be a Hermitian real form of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$. Then Z is a G -gradient manifold and every gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ is locally injective. Consequently, $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ separates locally almost the K -orbits in Z .

We will elaborate a little bit on further properties of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\tau: Z \rightarrow Z$ be the holomorphic symmetry which fixes the base point $z_0 = eK$. Then we have $Z^{\tau} = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$. Moreover, one can show that Z^{τ} is a K -invariant closed complex submanifold of Z and that every K -orbit in Z^{τ} is open in Z^{τ} . Furthermore, $K^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts on Z^{τ} and we have $K^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot z = K \cdot z$ if and only if $z \in Z^{\tau}$ holds. Finally, note that $\mu_{\mathfrak{k}}$ separates all K -orbits in Z .

3. Spherical gradient manifolds and coadjoint orbits

As we have remarked above it is very hard to verify directly if a given gradient map defined on X separates the K -orbits. The main result of this paper states that this is true if and only if X is a spherical gradient manifold. Hence, this is independent of the particular choice of a gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

In this section we give the definition of spherical gradient manifolds. For this we first review the definition of minimal parabolic subgroups. After that, we discuss the orbits of the adjoint K -action on $\mathfrak{p}$ which are the right analogues of complex flag varieties.

We continue the notation of the previous section: Let $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ be a closed compatible subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ and let X be a real-analytic G -gradient manifold with K -equivariant real-analytic gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$.

3.1. Minimal parabolic subgroups. — For more details and complete proofs of the material presented here we refer the reader to Chapter VII in [Kna02].

Since $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ is invariant under the Cartan involution θ of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$, the same holds for its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$. Consequently $\mathfrak{g}$ is reductive, i. e. $\mathfrak{g}$ is the direct sum of its center and of the semi-simple subalgebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$.

Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a maximal Abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}$ and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$ be the associated restricted root space decomposition. The centralizer $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ is θ -stable with decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ where $\mathfrak{m} = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathfrak{k}}(\mathfrak{a})$. On the group level we define $M := \mathcal{Z}_K(\mathfrak{a})$.

Let us fix a choice Λ^+ of positive restricted roots. Then we obtain the nilpotent subalgebra $\mathfrak{n} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$. Let A and N be the analytic subgroups of G with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{n}$, respectively. Then $AN \subset G$ is a simply-connected solvable closed subgroup of G , isomorphic to the semi-direct product $A \ltimes N$. One checks directly that M stabilizes each restricted root space $\mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$; together with the compactness of M this implies that $Q_0 := MAN$ is a closed subgroup of G .

Every subgroup of G which is conjugate to $Q_0 = MAN$ is called a *minimal parabolic subgroup*. A subgroup $Q \subset G$ is called *parabolic* if it contains a minimal parabolic subgroup.

Remark. — The notion of parabolic subgroups of G is independent of the choices made during the construction of Q_0 .

Example. — For $\xi \in \mathfrak{p}$ the group $Q := \{g \in G; \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \exp(t\xi)g \exp(-t\xi) \text{ exists in } G\}$ is a parabolic subgroup of G . It is a minimal parabolic subgroup if and only if ξ is regular, i. e. if and only if $K_{\xi} = M$.

If the group G is complex-reductive and connected, then minimal parabolic subgroups of G are the same as Borel subgroups. This motivates the following

Definition 3.1. — We call the G -gradient manifold X *spherical* if a minimal parabolic subgroup of G has an open orbit in X .

Note that X is spherical if and only if $Q_0 = MAN$ has an open orbit in X .

Example. — Let G be a real form of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ and let $X \subset Z$ be a totally real G -stable submanifold with $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} X = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} Z$. If Z is $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -spherical, then X is G -spherical in the above sense. This can be seen as follows. Since $Q_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a parabolic subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}} = G^{\mathbb{C}}$ and since Z is spherical, $Q_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ has an open orbit in Z . Since X is maximally totally real, X cannot be contained in the complement of the open $Q_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ -orbit in Z , hence we find a point $x \in X$ such that $Q_0^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot x$ is open in Z . Moreover, $Q_0 \cdot x$ is open in $(Q_0^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot x) \cap X$, which implies that X is spherical.

Example. — As a special case of the above example we note that weakly symmetric spaces are spherical gradient manifolds. More precisely, let $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ be connected complex-reductive and let $L^{\mathbb{C}}$ be a complex-reductive compatible subgroup of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. Let G be a connected compatible real form of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $L := L^{\mathbb{C}} \cap G$ is a compact real form of $L^{\mathbb{C}}$. According to Theorem 3.11 in [St08] the homogeneous manifold $X = G/L$ is a G -gradient manifold. By a result of Akhiezer and Vinberg ([AV99], compare also Chapter 12.6 in [Wo07]) $X = G/L$ is weakly symmetric if and only if the affine variety $G^{\mathbb{C}}/L^{\mathbb{C}}$ is spherical. This implies that if $X = G/L$ is weakly symmetric, then it is a spherical G -gradient manifold. The converse is false as the next example shows.

Example. — Let U be connected. A special case of Example 2.2 is the case that $Z = U^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\tau = \sigma = \theta$. Then we have $G = X = U$. Note that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} \equiv 0$ separates the K -orbits in X since X is K -homogeneous while in general μ does not separate the U -orbits in Z . Note also that $Q_0 = G$ is the only minimal parabolic subgroup of G and that G itself is the only subgroup of G having an open orbit in X . This explains the necessity to consider minimal parabolic subgroups instead of maximal connected solvable subgroups (which are maximal tori in G in this example).

3.2. Coadjoint orbits. — A class of examples of gradient manifolds is given by coadjoint orbits (see [HS07c]). Let $\alpha \in \mathfrak{u}^*$ and let $Z = U \cdot \alpha$ be the coadjoint orbit of α . Identifying $\mathfrak{u}^*$ with $\mathfrak{iu}$ as before, α corresponds to an element $\xi \in \mathfrak{iu}$ and Z corresponds to the orbit of ξ of the adjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{iu}$. Let $P := \{g \in U^{\mathbb{C}}; \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \exp(t\xi)g \exp(-t\xi) \text{ exists in } U^{\mathbb{C}}\}$ denote the parabolic subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ associated to ξ . Then the map $Z \rightarrow U^{\mathbb{C}}/P$, $u \cdot \xi \mapsto uP$, is a real analytic isomorphism. In particular it defines a complex structure and a holomorphic $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on Z . The reader should be warned that this $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action is not the adjoint action. The form $\omega(\eta_Z(\alpha), \zeta_Z(\alpha)) = -\alpha([\eta, \zeta])$ defines a U -invariant Kähler form on $Z = U \cdot \alpha$ such that the map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$, $\mu(u \cdot \alpha) = -\text{Ad}(u)\alpha$, is a moment map on Z . Identifying Z with U/U_{ξ} where U_{ξ} denotes the centralizer of ξ in U , the gradient map with respect to the action of $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ on Z is given by $\mu_{\mathfrak{iu}}: U/U_{\xi} \rightarrow \mathfrak{iu}$, $uU_{\xi} \mapsto -\text{Ad}(u)\xi$. The $U^{\mathbb{C}}$ -action on $U \cdot \xi \cong U^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ induces a G -action on $U \cdot \xi$.

Proposition 3.2 ([HS07c]). — *If $\xi \in \mathfrak{p}$, then $X := K \cdot \xi = G \cdot \xi$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of $Z \cong U \cdot \xi$.*

The G -isotropy at ξ is given by the parabolic subgroup $Q := P \cap G$ of G , so $G \cdot \xi$ is isomorphic to G/Q and to K/K_{ξ} if $\xi \in \mathfrak{p}$. Note also that G/Q is a compact G -invariant submanifold of $U^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ and in particular a G -gradient manifold with gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: K/K_{\xi} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(kK_{\xi}) = -\text{Ad}(k)\xi$.

Example. — Consider the action of $G = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ on projective space $Z = \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{C})$ induced by the standard representation of G on $\mathbb{C}^2$. Note that G is a compatible subgroup of $U^{\mathbb{C}} = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ where $U = \text{SU}(2)$. Moreover, Z can be realized as the coadjoint orbit $U^{\mathbb{C}}/B$ where B is the Borel subgroup $B = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z & w \\ 0 & z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}; z \in \mathbb{C}^*, w \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$. Then Z can be viewed as a 2-sphere in the 3-dimensional space $\mathfrak{iu}$. The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the projection onto the 2-dimensional subspace $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{iu}$. The action of K on $\mathfrak{iu}$ is given by rotation around the axes perpendicular to $\mathfrak{p}$. We observe that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits, but that it does not separate all K -orbits. This corresponds to the fact that there exist two open orbits with respect to the action of a minimal parabolic subgroup of G .

If $G = U^{\mathbb{C}}$ is complex reductive and acts algebraically on a connected algebraic variety Z , then the fibers of the moment map μ are connected ([HH96]). Also, if Z is spherical, then μ globally separates the U -orbits. The example above shows that one cannot expect $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to separate the K -orbits globally for actions of real-reductive groups due to the non-connectedness of the $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -fibers. Moreover, in the complex case an open orbit of a Borel subgroup is unique and dense in Z while this is no longer true for real-reductive groups.

4. The generic fibers of the restricted gradient map

By equivariance, the moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$ maps each orbit $U \cdot z$ onto the orbit $U \cdot \mu(z) \subset \mathfrak{u}^*$. Moreover, the restriction $\mu|_{U \cdot z}: U \cdot z \rightarrow U \cdot \mu(z)$ is a smooth fiber bundle with fiber $U_{\mu(z)}/U_z$. Theorem 26.5 in [GS84] states that generically these fibers are tori; in [HW90] this theorem is applied to characterize coisotropic U -actions.

In this section we generalize these results in our context. Let $x \in X$ and let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a maximal Abelian subspace of $\mathfrak{p}$ with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \in \mathfrak{a}$. Our goal is to prove that generically the group $M = \mathcal{Z}_K(\mathfrak{a})$ has an open orbit in the fiber $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x$ of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: K \cdot x \rightarrow K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$. For this we first have to discuss the notion of generic elements in X .

4.1. Generic elements. — There are several natural definitions of generic elements $x \in X$. We could require that the K -orbit through x has maximal dimension, or that the K -orbit through $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ has maximal dimension in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X)$, or that the rank of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ in x is maximal. It will turn out that we need all three properties.

Definition 4.1. — The element $x \in X$ is called generic if

1. the dimension of $K \cdot x$ is maximal,
2. the rank of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ in x is maximal, and
3. the dimension of $K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ is maximal in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X)$.

We write X_{gen} for the set of generic elements in X .

Remark. — In the complex case we have $\text{rk}_z \mu = \dim U \cdot z$; hence, condition (2) in Definition 4.1 is superfluous in this case.

For the following lemma we need the analyticity of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and of the K -action on X .

Lemma 4.2. — The set X_{gen} is K -invariant, open and dense in X .

Proof. — Since X/G is connected, the same is true for X/K . It is then a well-known consequence of the Slice Theorem that the set of points $x \in X$ such that $K \cdot x$ has maximal dimension is open and dense in X (see Theorem 3.1, Chapter IV in [Bre72]). Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ is real-analytic, its maximal rank set is also open and dense. Hence, $X' := \{x \in X; \dim K \cdot x, \text{rk}_x \mu_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ maximal}\}$ is open and dense in X .

We prove the lemma by showing that $X' \setminus X_{\text{gen}}$ is analytic in X' . Let $x_0 \in X' \setminus X_{\text{gen}}$. Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has constant rank on X' , there are local analytic coordinates (x, U) around x_0 in X and (y, V) around $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$ in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X)$ in which $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ takes the form $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is K -equivariant, U and V may be chosen K -invariant. Since $A := \{y \in V; \dim K \cdot y \text{ is not maximal in } V\}$ is analytic in V , we see that $(X' \setminus X_{\text{gen}}) \cap U = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(A)$ is analytic in U . Thus $X' \setminus X_{\text{gen}}$ is locally analytic in X and since it is closed, it is analytic. $\square$

4.2. The M -action on $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$. — In this subsection we discuss the restricted gradient map

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}|_{K \cdot x}: K \cdot x \rightarrow K \cdot \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x).$$

Recall that this map is a smooth fiber bundle with fiber $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x$.

Remark. — Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a maximal Abelian subspace of $\mathfrak{p}$. Then we have $M \subset K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$ for every $x \in X$ with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \in \mathfrak{a}$. Note that every K -orbit in X intersects $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$.

We will need the following lemma which extends the corresponding result in [GS84].

Lemma 4.3. — *For every $x \in X_{\text{gen}}$ we have $[\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}] \subset \mathfrak{p}_x$.*

Proof. — By definition of X_{gen} the set

$$E := \{(x, \xi, \eta) \in X_{\text{gen}} \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{p}; \xi \in \mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \eta \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}\}$$

is a linear subbundle of the trivial bundle $X_{\text{gen}} \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow X_{\text{gen}}$.

Let $\xi \in \mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$ and $\eta \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$, and let x_t be a smooth curve in X_{gen} with $x_0 = x$. Since $E \rightarrow X_{\text{gen}}$ is locally trivial, we find a smooth curve (x_t, ξ_t, η_t) in E with $\xi_0 = \xi$ and $\eta_0 = \eta$. Since $[\xi_t, \eta_t] \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_t)}$ for all t and since the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{p}$ is induced by a U -invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{u}$, we conclude

$$\langle \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_t), [\xi_t, \eta_t] \rangle = -\langle [\xi_t, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_t)], \eta_t \rangle = 0$$

for all t . Differentiating and evaluating at $t = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*,x} \dot{x}_0, [\xi, \eta] \rangle + \langle \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), [\dot{\xi}_0, \eta] \rangle + \langle \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), [\xi, \dot{\eta}_0] \rangle \\ &= \langle (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*,x} \dot{x}_0, [\xi, \eta] \rangle - \langle [\eta, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)], \dot{\xi}_0 \rangle - \langle [\xi, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)], \dot{\eta}_0 \rangle \\ &= \langle (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*,x} \dot{x}_0, [\xi, \eta] \rangle = g_x([\xi, \eta]_X(x), \dot{x}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since X_{gen} is open, every tangent vector $v \in T_x X$ is of the form $v = \dot{x}_0$ for some curve x_t which implies $[\xi, \eta]_X(x) = 0$, i. e. $[\xi, \eta] \in \mathfrak{p}_x$. $\square$

Now we are in the position to prove

Proposition 4.4. — *Suppose $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$. Then the orbit $M \cdot x$ is open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) \cap (K \cdot x)$.*

Let $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$ be given. In order to prove Proposition 4.4 it suffices to show that the map $\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/\mathfrak{k}_x$ is surjective. For this we need some information about $\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$ and $\mathfrak{k}_x$; the idea is of course to apply Lemma 4.3 which gives

$$[[\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}], [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]] \subset [\mathfrak{p}_x, \mathfrak{p}_x] \subset \mathfrak{k}_x.$$

Consequently we must determine $\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$ as well as their Lie brackets.

This is most conveniently done via the restricted root space decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$ with respect to the maximal Abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. The centralizer $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ is stable under the Cartan involution θ and decomposes as $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ where $\mathfrak{m} = \text{Lie}(M)$. For later use we note the following proposition which is proven in Chapter VI.5 of [Kna02].

Proposition 4.5. — *For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we write $\mathfrak{a}_{\lambda} \subset \mathfrak{a}$ for the subspace generated by the elements $[\xi_{\lambda}, \theta(\xi_{\lambda})]$ where $\xi_{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$. Then $\dim \mathfrak{a}_{\lambda} = 1$ and $\lambda[\xi_{\lambda}, \theta(\xi_{\lambda})] \neq 0$ for every $0 \neq \xi_{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda}$.*

In order to prove Proposition 4.4 we will first describe the centralizers of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{k}$ and in $\mathfrak{p}$. For this we introduce the subset $\Lambda(x) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda; \lambda(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) = 0\} \subset \Lambda$. We also write $\Lambda^+(x) := \Lambda(x) \cap \Lambda^+$.

Remark. — If $\lambda \in \Lambda(x)$, then $-\lambda \in \Lambda(x)$. If $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(x)$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$, then $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(x)$.

Lemma 4.6. — 1. The centralizer of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ is given by $\mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(x)} \mathfrak{g}_\lambda$.

2. We have $\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\}$.

3. We have $\mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\}$.

Proof. — In order to prove the first claim let $\xi = \xi_0 + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}$ and calculate

$$[\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), \xi] = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \lambda(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) \xi_\lambda.$$

Hence, ξ centralizes $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ if and only if $\xi_\lambda = 0$ for all $\lambda \notin \Lambda(x)$.

The other two claims follow from (1) together with the fact that $\theta(\mathfrak{g}_\lambda) = \mathfrak{g}_{-\lambda}$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. $\square$

It remains to show that $\left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{k}_x$ because then Lemma 4.6 implies that $\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} / \mathfrak{k}_x$ is surjective which in turn proves Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 4.7. — We have $\left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\} \subset \mathfrak{k}_x$.

Proof. — We will prove this lemma in three steps.

In the first step we prove

$$\mathfrak{p}^x := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(x)} \mathfrak{a}_\lambda \oplus \left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\} \subset [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}].$$

Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)$ and $\xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda$. Then we have $\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda) \in \mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$, and we may choose an element $\eta \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $\lambda(\eta) \neq 0$. Because of

$$\xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda) = -\frac{1}{\lambda(\eta)} [\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda), \eta] \in [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]$$

we obtain $\left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\} \subset [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]$.

Moreover,

$$[\xi_\lambda, \theta(\xi_\lambda)] = -\frac{1}{2} [\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda), \xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda)] \in [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]$$

implies $\mathfrak{a}_\lambda \subset [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]$.

The second step consists in showing

$$\left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\} \subset [\mathfrak{p}^x, \mathfrak{p}^x].$$

To see this, let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)$ and $0 \neq \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda$ be arbitrary. Then we have $\xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda) \in \mathfrak{p}^x$ and $[\xi_\lambda, \theta(\xi_\lambda)] \in \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$. Moreover, Proposition 4.5 implies $\lambda[\xi_\lambda, \theta(\xi_\lambda)] \neq 0$, which gives

$$\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda[\xi_\lambda, \theta(\xi_\lambda)]} [[\xi_\lambda, \theta(\xi_\lambda)], \xi_\lambda - \theta(\xi_\lambda)] \in [\mathfrak{p}^x, \mathfrak{p}^x].$$

In the last step we combine the results obtained so far with Lemma 4.3 and arrive at

$$\left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+(x)} (\xi_\lambda + \theta(\xi_\lambda)); \xi_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \right\} \subset [\mathfrak{p}^x, \mathfrak{p}^x] \subset [[\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}], [\mathfrak{k}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}, \mathfrak{p}_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}]] \subset \mathfrak{k}_x,$$

which was to be shown. $\square$

Hence, the proof of Proposition 4.4 is finished.

4.3. An equivalent condition of the separation property. — Proposition 4.4 allows us to formulate an equivalent condition for $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to separate locally almost the K -orbits which generalizes the notion of K -spherical symplectic manifolds defined in [HW90].

Proposition 4.8. — *The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits if and only if $\dim(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} = \dim M - \dim M_x$ for one (and then every) $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$.*

Proof. — Let us suppose first that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. By definition, this means that there is an open K -invariant subset $\Omega \subset X$ such that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))^0 = K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}^0 \cdot x$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

Since X_{gen} is dense, we find an element $x \in \Omega \cap X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$. It follows from maximality of $\text{rk}_x \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)) \cap X_{\text{gen}}$ is a closed submanifold of X_{gen} . By Lemma 5.1 in [HS07b], we obtain $\dim \ker(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*,x} = \dim(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp}$. Hence, we conclude $\dim K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}/K_x = \dim(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp}$. Since by Proposition 4.4 the orbit $M \cdot x$ is open in $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} \cdot x$, we finally obtain $\dim(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} = \dim M/M_x = \dim M - \dim M_x$ which was to be shown.

In order to prove the converse let $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$ be given. Our assumption implies that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$ is a closed submanifold of X of dimension $\dim(\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} = \dim M - \dim M_x$. We conclude that $M \cdot x$ and hence $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)} \cdot x$ are open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))$. Therefore we have $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x))^0 = K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}^0 \cdot x$, which means that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ separates the K -orbits in X_{gen} . $\square$

Let us note explicitly the following corollary of the proof of Proposition 4.8.

Corollary 4.9. — *If $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits in X , then it almost separates the K -orbits in the dense open set X_{gen} .*

Consequently, if $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits in X , then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ induces a map $X_{\text{gen}}/K \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K \cong \mathfrak{a}/W$ whose fibers are discrete.

5. Proof of the main theorem

In the first subsection we review the shifting technique for gradient maps which translates the problem of finding an open Q_0 -orbit in X into the problem of finding an open G -orbit in the bigger gradient manifold $X \times (K/M)$. Since G is real-reductive, we may apply the techniques developed in [HS07b] to solve the second problem.

Afterwards, it remains to find an open G -orbit in $X \times (K/M)$ under the assumption that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. This is done in two steps: First we construct a special gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on $X \times (K/M)$ for which the set of global minima of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$ can be controlled. This will then be essentially used in the proof of existence of an open Q_0 -orbit.

In the final subsection we prove the remaining implication (3) $\implies$ (2) in our main theorem: If the minimal parabolic subgroup Q_0 has an open orbit in X , then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits.

5.1. The shifting technique. — Since the minimal parabolic subgroup $Q_0 = MAN$ is not compatible, we cannot apply the theory developed in [HS07b] in order to link the action of Q_0 on X with the theory of gradient maps. Therefore, we reformulate the problem of finding an open Q_0 -orbit in X as the problem of finding an open G -orbit in a larger manifold.

Lemma 5.1. — *Let Q be a parabolic subgroup of G . Then Q has an open orbit in X if and only if G has an open orbit in $X \times (G/Q)$ with respect to the diagonal action.*

Proof. — Recall that the twisted product $G \times_Q X$ is by definition the quotient space of $G \times X$ by the Q -action $q \cdot (g, x) := (gq^{-1}, q \cdot x)$. We denote the element $Q \cdot (g, x) \in G \times_Q X$ by $[g, x]$. Then G acts on $G \times_Q X$ by $g \cdot [h, x] := [gh, x]$, and every G -orbit in $G \times_Q X$ intersects $X \cong \{[e, x]; x \in X\}$ in a Q -orbit. Thus, the inclusion $X \hookrightarrow G \times_Q X$, $x \mapsto [e, x]$, induces a homeomorphism $X/Q \cong (G \times_Q X)/G$. In particular, Q has an open orbit in X if and only if G has an open orbit in $G \times_Q X$.

The claim follows now from the fact that the map $G \times_Q X \rightarrow X \times (G/Q)$, $[g, x] \mapsto (g \cdot x, gQ)$, is a G -equivariant diffeomorphism with respect to the diagonal G -action on $X \times (G/Q)$. To see this, it is sufficient to note that its inverse map is given by $(x, gQ) \mapsto [g, g^{-1} \cdot x]$. $\square$

The gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on X induces in a natural way a gradient map on the product $\tilde{X} := X \times (G/Q)$ as follows. First recall from Section 3.2 that G/Q is a G -invariant closed submanifold of an adjoint U -orbit of an element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{p}$. In particular G/Q is isomorphic to K/K_{γ} and is equipped with a gradient map $kK_{\gamma} \mapsto -\text{Ad}(k)\xi$. The gradient maps on X and on K/K_{γ} induce a gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on $\tilde{X}$, which is given by the sum of those two gradient maps. Explicitly, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, kK_{\gamma}) = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\gamma.$$

Note that the choice of $\gamma \in \mathfrak{p}$ depends only on the isotropy K_{γ} . In particular, if Q is a minimal parabolic subgroup of G , or equivalently if K_{γ} equals the centralizer M of $\mathfrak{a}$ in K , then for every regular $\gamma \in \mathfrak{p}$, the assignment $(x, kM) \mapsto \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\gamma$ defines a gradient map on $\tilde{X}$.

5.2. The shifted gradient map. — Our goal is to construct a gradient map on $\tilde{X} = X \times (K/M)$ which enables us to control the minima of the associated function $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$.

Let $\mathfrak{a}_+$ denote the closed Weyl chamber in $\mathfrak{a}$ associated to our choice of positive restricted roots. We generalize an inequality in [HS07a] which is a consequence of Kostant's Convexity Theorem ([Kos73]).

Lemma 5.2. — *Let $\gamma, \xi \in \mathfrak{a}_+$ and assume that ξ is regular. Then*

$$\|\text{Ad}(k)\gamma - \xi\| \geq \|\gamma - \xi\|$$

for all $k \in K$. The inequality is strict for all $k \notin K_{\gamma}$.

Proof. — The K -invariance of the inner product implies

$$\|\text{Ad}(k)\gamma - \xi\|^2 - \|\gamma - \xi\|^2 = -2 \cdot \langle \text{Ad}(k)\gamma - \gamma, \xi \rangle.$$

Let $\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}$ denote the orthogonal projection of $\mathfrak{p}$ onto $\mathfrak{a}$. Then $\langle \text{Ad}(k)\gamma, \xi \rangle = \langle \pi_{\mathfrak{a}}(\text{Ad}(k)\gamma), \xi \rangle$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}(\text{Ad}(k)\gamma)$ is contained in the convex hull of the orbit of the Weyl group $W := \mathcal{N}_K(\mathfrak{a})/\mathcal{Z}_K(\mathfrak{a})$ through ξ ([Kos73]). Since K acts by unitary operators, we have $\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}(\text{Ad}(k)\gamma) = \gamma$ if and only if $k \in K_{\gamma}$. Therefore it suffices to show that $\langle \text{Ad}(w)\gamma - \gamma, \xi \rangle < 0$ for all $w \in W$, $w \notin W_{\gamma}$.

Let λ be a simple restricted root and σ_{λ} the corresponding reflection. Then either $\sigma_{\lambda}(\gamma) = \gamma$ or $\sigma_{\lambda}(\gamma) - \gamma = c \cdot \lambda$ for some $c < 0$. Here we have identified $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ with its dual in $\mathfrak{a}$. Since ξ is regular, this implies $\langle \sigma_{\lambda}(\gamma) - \gamma, \xi \rangle < 0$ if $\sigma_{\lambda} \notin W_{\gamma}$.

An arbitrary element $w \in W$ is of the form $w = \sigma_{\lambda_1} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{\lambda_k}$ for simple restricted roots $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(w)\gamma - \gamma &= (\sigma_{\lambda_1} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{\lambda_k}(\gamma) - \sigma_{\lambda_2} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{\lambda_k}(\gamma)) \\ &\quad + (\sigma_{\lambda_2} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{\lambda_k}(\gamma) - \sigma_{\lambda_3} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{\lambda_k}(\gamma)) \\ &\quad + \cdots + (\sigma_{\lambda_k}(\gamma) - \gamma) \end{aligned}$$

is a linear combination of simple restricted roots with negative coefficients and it equals 0 if and only if $\sigma_{\lambda_j} \in W_\gamma$ for all j . Again, since ξ is regular, this implies $\langle \text{Ad}(w)\gamma - \gamma, \xi \rangle < 0$ for all $w \in W$, $w \notin W_\gamma$. $\square$

Since each K -orbit in $\mathfrak{p}$ intersects $\mathfrak{a}$ in an orbit of the Weyl group, each K -orbit $K \cdot x$ in X contains an x_0 with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) \in \mathfrak{a}_+$. Recall that each $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}_+$ defines a gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, kM) = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\xi$.

Proposition 5.3. — *Let $x_0 \in X_{\text{gen}}$ with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) \in \mathfrak{a}_+$. Then there exists a regular $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}_+$, such that*

1. (x_0, eM) is a global minimum of the function $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$.
2. If $(x, kM) \in \tilde{X}$ is another global minimum of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$, then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) = \text{Ad}(k)\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$.

Proof. — If $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$ is regular, define $\xi := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$. Then $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0, eM)\|^2 = 0$ and (x_0, eM) is a global minimum of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$. If (x, kM) is another global minimum, we have $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\xi = 0$ and the second claim follows.

Now assume that $\gamma := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$ is singular. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ be those simple restricted roots vanishing at γ . Let $\mathfrak{b} := \{\eta \in \mathfrak{a}; \lambda_1(\eta) = \dots = \lambda_k(\eta) = 0\}$ be the subspace of $\mathfrak{a}$ where these roots vanish. Let $\mathfrak{b}^\perp$ be the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{b}$ in $\mathfrak{a}$. Since x_0 is regular, the orbit $K \cdot \gamma$ has maximal dimension in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X)$. Therefore $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X) \cap \mathfrak{a}$ is contained in the union of the finitely many subspaces of $\mathfrak{a}$ where at least k simple restricted roots vanish. Choosing a regular element $\xi \in \gamma + \mathfrak{b}^\perp$ which is sufficiently near γ , we can assure that γ is the unique point in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(X) \cap \mathfrak{a}_+$ with minimal distance to ξ .

Let $(x, kM) \in \tilde{X}$ and let $l \in K$ with $\gamma' := \text{Ad}(l)\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(k^{-1} \cdot x) \in \mathfrak{a}_+$. With Lemma 5.2 and the definition of ξ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, kM)\|^2 &= \|\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\xi\|^2 = \|\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(k^{-1} \cdot x) - \xi\|^2 \\ &\geq \|\gamma' - \xi\|^2 \geq \|\gamma - \xi\|^2 = \|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0, eM)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

so in particular (x_0, eM) is a global minimum of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$. Equality holds if and only if $\gamma' = \gamma$ and $l \in K_{\gamma'} = K_\gamma$. The latter condition gives $\text{Ad}(k)\gamma = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$. $\square$

In Lemma 5.1, we reformulated the property that a parabolic subgroup Q has an open orbit in X as a property on the G -action on the product $X \times (G/Q)$. Now, we translate the condition, that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits to a suitable condition on the shifted gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on the product $X \times (G/Q)$.

Lemma 5.4. — *Let $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ and let $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ be the associated gradient map. Let $x_0 \in X$ with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) \in \mathfrak{a}_+$ and set $\beta := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) - \xi = \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0, eM)$. Then the inclusion $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)) \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)$, $x \mapsto (x, eM)$, induces an injective continuous map $\Phi: \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))/M \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)/K_\beta$. If ξ is chosen such that the conclusions of Proposition 5.3 are satisfied, then Φ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. — First note that the map $\Phi: \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))/M \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)/K_{\beta}$ is well-defined since M is contained in K_{β} and $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)}$ and since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are K -equivariant.

For injectivity, let $x, y \in \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))$ with $K_{\beta} \cdot (x, eM) = K_{\beta} \cdot (y, eM)$. The latter condition implies $M \cdot x = M \cdot y$ since $K_{\beta} \cap M = M$. This shows injectivity.

Assume that $x_0 \in \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))$ satisfies the conclusions of Proposition 5.3 and let $(x, kM) \in \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)$. Then (x, kM) is a global minimum of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$ which implies $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) = \text{Ad}(k)\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$. We conclude $\beta = \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, kM) = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\xi = \text{Ad}(k)(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) - \xi) = \text{Ad}(k)\beta$. This proves $k \in K_{\beta}$. Consequently $K_{\beta} \cdot (x, kM)$ intersects $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)) \times \{eM\}$ and surjectivity follows. Finally, the inclusion $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)) \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)$ is continuous and proper, so Φ is continuous and proper which implies that it is a homeomorphism. $\square$

5.3. Existence of an open Q_0 -orbit. — Finally we are in the position to prove that Q_0 has an open orbit in X given that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits.

Let us fix a point $x_0 \in X_{\text{gen}}$ such that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$ lies in the closed Weyl chamber $\mathfrak{a}_+$. By virtue of Proposition 5.3 we find a regular element $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}_+$ such that $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \times (K/M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $(x, kM) \mapsto \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\xi$, is a G -gradient map and such that $\tilde{x}_0 := (x_0, eM)$ is a global minimum of $\|\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}\|^2$. Let $Q_0 = MAN$ be the minimal parabolic subgroup of G associated to ξ . Then we may identify K/M with G/Q_0 as gradient manifolds. Let $\beta := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0) - \xi$. By Lemma 5.4 the quotients $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))/M$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)/K_{\beta}$ are homeomorphic. This implies that $K_{\beta} \cdot \tilde{x}_0$ is open in $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)$.

As we have already seen in the proof of Lemma 2.1, it suffices to prove $(\mathfrak{p} \cdot \tilde{x}_0)^{\perp} \subset \mathfrak{k} \cdot \tilde{x}_0$, for then the orbit $G \cdot \tilde{x}_0$ is open in $X \times (G/Q_0)$ which in turn implies that $Q_0 \cdot x_0$ is open in X . For this we will show that $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has maximal rank in $\tilde{x}_0$ as follows. The image of $T_{x_0}X \oplus T_{eM}K/M$ under $(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, \tilde{x}_0}$ coincides with $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x_0}(T_{x_0}X) + [\xi, \xi]$. Since ξ is regular, we obtain

$$[\xi, \xi] = \left\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} (\xi_{\lambda} - \theta(\xi_{\lambda})); \xi_{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda} \right\} = \mathfrak{a}^{\perp}.$$

We use the decomposition $T_x X = (\mathfrak{k} \cdot x) \oplus (\mathfrak{k} \cdot x)^{\perp}$ and note that $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x}$ maps $\mathfrak{k} \cdot x$ into $\mathfrak{a}^{\perp}$ for all x in a neighborhood of x_0 . Since moreover $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits, one would expect that $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x_0}$ maps a subspace of $T_{x_0}X$ which is transversal to $\mathfrak{k} \cdot x_0$ onto a subspace of $\mathfrak{p}$ which is transversal to $\mathfrak{a}^{\perp}$. This is the content of the following

Lemma 5.5. — *Assume that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. For every $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$ we have $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x}((\mathfrak{k} \cdot x)^{\perp}) \cap \mathfrak{a}^{\perp} = \{0\}$.*

Proof. — Since x is generic, there exists an open neighborhood $V \subset X$ of x such that the rank of $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is constant on V . We conclude that $V \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$ is a submanifold of V and that the image $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(V \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}))$ is an open subset of the linear subspace $\mathfrak{b} := \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda(x)} \ker(\lambda) \subset \mathfrak{a}$. Moreover, we have $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(V)$ is an open subset of $K \cdot \mathfrak{b} \cong K \times_{K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}} \mathfrak{b} = (K/K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}) \times \mathfrak{b}$.

Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ separates the K -orbits and since x is generic, we have $\ker(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x} = (\mathfrak{p} \cdot x)^{\perp} \subset \mathfrak{k} \cdot x$ which implies that $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x}$ is injective on $(\mathfrak{k} \cdot x)^{\perp}$. Consequently, $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ induces an injective immersion $V/K \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}$, therefore $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x}$ maps $(\mathfrak{k} \cdot x)^{\perp}$ bijectively onto $\mathfrak{b}$. Since $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{a}^{\perp} = \{0\}$, the claim follows. $\square$

We conclude from Lemma 5.5 that the image of $(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, \tilde{x}_0}$ is given by $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x_0}((\mathfrak{k} \cdot x_0)^{\perp}) \oplus \mathfrak{a}^{\perp}$. Since x_0 is generic, the dimension of $(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{*, x}((\mathfrak{k} \cdot x)^{\perp})$ is the same for all x in a neighborhood of x_0 . Furthermore, every K -orbit in $X \times (K/M)$ intersects $X \times \{eM\}$, thus the rank of $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$

is constant in a neighborhood of $\tilde{x}_0$. Consequently, the rank of $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ must be maximal in $\tilde{x}_0$. Together with the fact that $K_{\beta} \cdot \tilde{x}_0$ is open in $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta)$ this yields

$$(\mathfrak{p} \cdot \tilde{x}_0)^{\perp} = T_{\tilde{x}_0} \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\beta) = \mathfrak{k}_{\beta} \cdot \tilde{x}_0 \subset \mathfrak{k} \cdot \tilde{x}_0.$$

Therefore we obtain $T_{\tilde{x}_0} \tilde{X} = \mathfrak{p} \cdot \tilde{x}_0 \oplus (\mathfrak{p} \cdot \tilde{x}_0)^{\perp} \subset \mathfrak{p} \cdot \tilde{x}_0 + \mathfrak{k} \cdot \tilde{x}_0$ which shows that $G \cdot \tilde{x}_0$ is open in $\tilde{X}$.

This proves the implication (1) $\implies$ (3) of our main theorem and gives in addition a precise description of the set of open Q_0 -orbits in X .

Theorem 5.6. — *Suppose that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. Let $x_0 \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_+)$ be given, let ξ be the element from Proposition 5.3, and let Q_0 be the minimal parabolic subgroup of G associated to ξ . Then $Q_0 \cdot x_0$ is open in X .*

The same method of proof gives the following

Proposition 5.7. — *Suppose that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ locally almost separates the K -orbits. Let $x \in X_{\text{gen}} \cap \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})$ and let Q be the parabolic subgroup of G associated to $\beta := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$. Then $Q \cdot x$ is open in X .*

Proof. — In order to show that $Q \cdot x$ is open in X , it suffices to show that $G \cdot (x, eQ)$ is open in $X \times (G/Q)$. For this we note that $G/Q \cong K/K_{\beta}$ as a K -manifold and that for the shifted gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \times (K/K_{\beta}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $(x, kK_{\beta}) \mapsto \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \text{Ad}(k)\beta$ the element (x, eK_{β}) lies in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then the same arguments as above apply to show that $G \cdot (x, eK_{\beta})$ is open. $\square$

5.4. Proof of (3) $\implies$ (2). — In this subsection we complete the proof of our main theorem by showing the remaining non-trivial implication.

Proposition 5.8. — *Suppose that Q_0 has an open orbit in X . Then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$ almost separates the K -orbits.*

Proof. — Let $x_0 \in X$ be given. We must show that $K_{\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)} \cdot x_0$ is open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0))$. Let $\gamma := \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0)$ and let Q be the parabolic subgroup of G associated to γ . Recall that $G/Q \cong K/K_{\gamma}$ is a G -gradient space with gradient map $kK_{\gamma} \mapsto -\text{Ad}(k)\gamma$. Consider the shifted gradient map $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \times (K/K_{\gamma}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $(x, kK_{\gamma}) \mapsto x - \text{Ad}(k)\gamma$. Since the minimal parabolic subgroup Q_0 has an open orbit in X , the same is true for Q . Hence G has an open orbit in $X \times (K/K_{\gamma})$ by Lemma 5.1.

By definition of γ , we have $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0, \gamma) = 0$. Consider the set of semistable points $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)) = \{\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}; \overline{G \cdot \tilde{x}} \cap \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset\}$. It is open in $\tilde{X}$ ([HS07c]) and contains (x_0, γ) .

By analyticity of the action, the union V of the open G -orbits in $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0))$ is dense in $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0))$. We note also that the union of the open G -orbits is locally finite in $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0))$ which can be seen as follows. For every $p \in \tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$ there exists a slice neighborhood $G \cdot S \cong G \times_{G_x} S$ where G_x is a compatible subgroup of G and S can be viewed as an open neighborhood of 0 in a G_x -representation space. Since G_x has at most finitely many open orbits in this representation space, we conclude that only finitely many open G -orbits intersect the open set $G \cdot S$ which shows that the union of the open G -orbits in $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0))$ is locally finite.

Let W be the union of open G -orbits which contain (x_0, γ) in their closure and let $\overline{W}$ be the closure of W in $\mathcal{S}_G(\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0))$. Then W consists of only finitely many open G -orbits and consequently $\overline{W}$ contains an open neighborhood of (x_0, γ) . By Corollary 11.18 in [HS07b], $\overline{W}$ intersects $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$ in $K \cdot (x_0, \gamma)$. Therefore $K \cdot (x_0, \gamma)$ is isolated in $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$ which shows that the quotient $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)/K$ is discrete. Then $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\gamma)/M$ is discrete by Lemma 5.4 which means

that the M -orbits in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\gamma)$ are open. But $M < K^\gamma$ so the K^γ -orbits are open in $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(\gamma)$ as well. $\square$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Corollary 5.9. — *Let X be a spherical G -gradient manifold. Then every G -stable real-analytic submanifold Y of X is also spherical.*

Proof. — The claim follows from the facts that Y is a G -gradient manifold with respect to $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}|_Y$ and that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}|_Y$ almost separates the K -orbits in Y since this is true for $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$. $\square$

Corollary 5.10. — *If one G -gradient map locally almost separates the K -orbits in X , then every G -gradient map on X almost separates the K -orbits.*

6. Applications

6.1. Homogeneous semi-stable spherical gradient manifolds. — Let $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$ be connected real-reductive and let X be a spherical G -gradient manifold with gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$. We have seen in Lemma 2.1 that G has an open orbit in X . In this subsection we consider the case that $X = G/H$ is homogeneous. In addition, we suppose that X is semi-stable, i.e. that $X = \mathcal{S}_G(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ holds. Consequently, we may assume that H is of the form $H = K_H \exp(\mathfrak{p}_H)$ with $K_H = K \cap H$ and $\mathfrak{p}_H = \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{h}$.

Remark. — The class of homogeneous semi-stable spherical gradient manifolds generalizes the class of homogeneous affine spherical varieties in the complex setting.

Let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_H \oplus \mathfrak{p}_H^\perp$ be a K_H -invariant decomposition; then we have the Mostow decomposition $G/H \cong K \times_{K_H} \mathfrak{p}_H^\perp$ (see Theorem 9.3 in [HS07b] for a proof which uses gradient maps). Since X is spherical, we conclude from Theorem 1 that the Mostow gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: G/H \cong K \times_{K_H} \mathfrak{p}_H^\perp \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$, $[k, \xi] \mapsto \text{Ad}(k)\xi$, almost separates the K -orbits. In other words, the inclusion $\mathfrak{p}_H^\perp \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ induces a map $\mathfrak{p}_H^\perp/K_H \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ which has discrete fibers. This discussion proves the following

Proposition 6.1. — *Let $X = G/H$ be a semi-stable homogeneous G -gradient manifold and suppose that $H = K_H \exp(\mathfrak{p}_H)$ is compatible in $G = K \exp(\mathfrak{p})$. Then X is spherical if and only if the map $\mathfrak{p}_H^\perp/K_H \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ induced by the inclusion $\mathfrak{p}_H^\perp \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ has discrete fibers.*

Example. — For $H = \{e\}$ we have $K_H = \{e\}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_H^\perp = \mathfrak{p}$. Consequently, $X = G$ is spherical if and only if the quotient map $\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ has discrete fibers, i.e. if and only if K acts trivially on $\mathfrak{p}$.

Finally, we show that reductive symmetric spaces are spherical. Recall that G/H is a reductive symmetric space if there is an involutive automorphism τ on G such that $(G^\tau)^0 \subset H \subset G^\tau$ holds. In this situation we may assume without loss of generality that τ commutes with the Cartan involution θ . Hence, $H = K^\tau \exp(\mathfrak{p}^\tau)$ is compatible. In order to show that $X = G/H$ is spherical, we must prove that $\mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}/K^\tau \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/K$ has discrete fibers. From $[\mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}, \mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}] \subset \mathfrak{k}^\tau$ we conclude that every K^τ -orbit in $\mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}$ intersects a maximal Abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a}_0 \subset \mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}$ in an orbit of the finite group $W_0 := \mathcal{N}_{K^\tau}(\mathfrak{a}_0)/\mathcal{Z}_{K^\tau}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$. Extending $\mathfrak{a}_0$ to a maximal Abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$ we see that $\mathfrak{p}^{-\tau}/K^\tau \cong \mathfrak{a}_0/W_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/W \cong \mathfrak{p}/K$ has indeed finite fibers. Therefore we have proven the following

Proposition 6.2. — *Let $X = G/H$ be a semi-stable homogeneous gradient manifold. If H is a symmetric subgroup of G , then the Mostow gradient map $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ has finite fibers.*

6.2. Relation to multiplicity-free representations. — Let X be a real-analytic G -gradient manifold. Then G acts linearly on the space $\mathcal{C}^\omega(X)$ of complex-valued real-analytic functions on X . Since G is a compatible subgroup of some complex-reductive group $U^\mathbb{C}$, we observe that G embeds as a closed subgroup into its complexification $G^\mathbb{C}$. Moreover, if G contains no non-compact Abelian factors, then $G^\mathbb{C}$ is complex-reductive.

Proposition 6.3. — *Suppose that G acts properly on X and that $G^\mathbb{C}$ is complex-reductive. If the G -representation on $\mathcal{C}^\omega(X)$ is multiplicity-free, then X is spherical.*

Proof. — As is proven in [Hei93], there exists a Stein $G^\mathbb{C}$ -manifold $X^\mathbb{C}$ such that X admits a G -equivariant embedding as a closed maximally totally real submanifold into $X^\mathbb{C}$. According to the example discussed in Section 2.2 it suffices to show that $X^\mathbb{C}$ is $G^\mathbb{C}$ -spherical.

In order to see this, note that the restriction mapping $\mathcal{O}(X^\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)$ is injective and G -equivariant. This implies that the G - (and hence also the $G^\mathbb{C}$ -)representation on $\mathcal{O}(X^\mathbb{C})$ is multiplicity-free. Therefore, Theorem 2 in [AH04] applies to show that $X^\mathbb{C}$ is spherical which finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark. — In Proposition 6.3 properness of the G -action on X is needed to guarantee the existence of the complexification $X^\mathbb{C}$. If $X = G/H$ is homogeneous, then we may take $X^\mathbb{C} := G^\mathbb{C}/H^\mathbb{C}$ and the same argument as above shows: If the G -representation on $\mathcal{C}^\omega(G/H)$ is multiplicity-free, then G/H is spherical.

Even if we assume that G acts properly on X , the converse of Proposition 6.3 does not hold as the following example shows.

Example. — Let $G = K$ be a compact Lie group acting by left multiplication on $X = K$. Then $\mu_p \equiv 0$ separates the K -orbits in X but the K -representation on $\mathcal{C}^\omega(K)$ is not multiplicity-free which can be deduced from the Peter-Weyl Theorem.

However, there is a special class of real-reductive Lie groups for which the proof of the complex multiplicity-freeness result generalizes to the real situation. A real-reductive Lie group G belongs to this class if the minimal parabolic subalgebras $\mathfrak{q}_0 = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ are solvable, i. e. if $\mathfrak{m}$ is Abelian.

Example. — Among the classical semi-simple Lie groups this is the case e. g. for $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathrm{Sp}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathrm{SU}(p, p)$, $\mathrm{SO}(p, p)$ and $\mathrm{SO}(p, p+1)$ (see Appendix C.3 in [Kna02]).

Lemma 6.4. — *Let X be a spherical G -gradient manifold. If the minimal parabolic subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ are solvable, then the G -representation on $\mathcal{C}^\omega(X)$ is multiplicity-free.*

Proof. — We must show that $\dim \mathrm{Hom}_G(V, \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)) \leq 1$ holds for every complex finite-dimensional irreducible G -module V . Let $Q_0 = MAN$ be a minimal parabolic subgroup of G and let V be a complex finite-dimensional irreducible G -module. By Engel's Theorem the space V^N of N -invariant vectors has positive dimension. The restriction map induces a linear map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_G(V, \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{MA}(V^N, \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)^N),$$

which is injective since V^N generates V as a G -module. Hence, it is enough to show $\dim \mathrm{Hom}_{MA}(V^N, \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)^N) \leq 1$. Let us assume the contrary. Then there are linearly independent functions $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\omega(X)^N$ which transform under the same character of the Abelian group M^0A . Consequently, the quotient f_1/f_2 is a real-analytic function defined on the dense open set $\{f_2 \neq 0\}$ and invariant under $Q_0^0 = M^0AN$. Since this contradicts the assumption that Q_0 has an open orbit in X , the proof is finished. $\square$

6.3. Open Borel-orbits are Stein. — In this subsection we consider the holomorphic situation, i. e. $G = U^{\mathbb{C}}$ is complex-reductive and acts holomorphically on the Kähler manifold Z such that the U -action is Hamiltonian with moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$. In Section 5 we have given a new proof of the following result of Brion.

Theorem 6.5. — *The moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$ separates the U -orbits in Z if and only if Z is spherical, i. e. if a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$ has an open orbit in Z .*

In this subsection we will show that our proof further implies that the open B -orbit in Z is Stein.

Proposition 6.6. — *If the moment map $\mu: Z \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}^*$ separates the U -orbits in Z , then the open B -orbit in Z is Stein.*

Proof. — Let $z \in Z$ be a generic element and let $Q \subset G$ be the parabolic subgroup associated to $\mu(z)$. Consequently, the zero fiber of the shifted moment map on the Kähler manifold $Z \times (G/Q)$ is non-empty. We may assume without loss of generality that the element $(z, eQ) \in Z \times (G/Q)$ is contained in this zero fiber. By Proposition 5.7 the orbit $G \cdot (z, eQ)$ is open in $Z \times (G/Q)$ which in turn implies that $Q \cdot z$ is open in Z . Moreover, since (z, eQ) lies in the zero fiber of a moment map, the isotropy $G_{(z, eQ)} = G_z \cap Q = Q_z$ is complex-reductive which proves that $Q \cdot z \cong Q/Q_z$ is Stein (see Theorem 5 in [MM60]). The open B -orbit in Z must be contained in $Q \cdot z$ and is therefore holomorphically separable. Applying a result of Huckleberry and Oeljeklaus ([HO86]) we finally see that the open B -orbit is Stein. $\square$

References

- [AH04] D. AKHIEZER & P. HEINZNER – “Spherical Stein spaces”, *Manuscripta Math.* **114** (2004), no. 3, p. 327–334.
- [AV99] D. AKHIEZER & E. B. VINBERG – “Weakly symmetric spaces and spherical varieties”, *Transform. Groups* **4** (1999), no. 1, p. 3–24.
- [Bre72] G. E. BREDON – *Introduction to compact transformation groups*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 46, Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.
- [Bri87] M. BRION – “Sur l’image de l’application moment”, in *Séminaire d’algèbre Paul Dubreil et Marie-Paule Malliavin (Paris, 1986)*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1296, Springer, Berlin, 1987, p. 177–192.
- [GS84] V. GUILLEMIN & S. STERNBERG – *Symplectic techniques in physics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
- [Hei93] P. HEINZNER – “Equivariant holomorphic extensions of real analytic manifolds”, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **121** (1993), no. 3, p. 445–463.
- [HH96] P. HEINZNER & A. T. HUCKLEBERRY – “Kählerian potentials and convexity properties of the moment map”, *Invent. Math.* **126** (1996), no. 1, p. 65–84.
- [HS07a] P. HEINZNER & P. SCHÜTZDELLER – “Convexity properties of gradient maps”, arXiv:0710.1152v1 [math.CV], 2007.
- [HS07b] P. HEINZNER & G. W. SCHWARZ – “Cartan decomposition of the moment map”, *Math. Ann.* **337** (2007), no. 1, p. 197–232.
- [HS07c] P. HEINZNER & H. STÖTZEL – “Semistable points with respect to real forms”, *Math. Ann.* **338** (2007), no. 1, p. 1–9.
- [Ho65] G. HOCHSCHILD – *The structure of Lie groups*, Holden-Day Inc., San Francisco, 1965.
- [HO86] A. T. HUCKLEBERRY & E. OELJEKLAUS – “On holomorphically separable complex solv-manifolds”, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **36** (1986), no. 3, p. 57–65.
- [HW90] A. T. HUCKLEBERRY & T. WURZBACHER – “Multiplicity-free complex manifolds”, *Math. Ann.* **286** (1990), no. 1-3, p. 261–280.

- [Kna02] A. W. KNAPP – *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, second ed., Progress in Mathematics, vol. 140, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
- [Kos73] B. KOSTANT – “On convexity, the Weyl group and the Iwasawa decomposition”, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **6** (1973), p. 413–455.
- [MM60] Y. MATSUSHIMA & A. MORIMOTO – “Sur certains espaces fibrés holomorphes sur une variété de Stein”, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **88** (1960), p. 137–155.
- [St08] H. STÖTZEL – “Quotients of real reductive group actions related to orbit type strata”, Dissertation, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 2008.
- [Wo07] J. A. WOLF – *Harmonic analysis on commutative spaces*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 142, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.

CHRISTIAN MIEBACH, Centre de Mathématiques et Informatique, UMR-CNRS 6632 (LATP), 39, rue Joliot-Curie, Université de Provence, 13453 Marseille Cedex 13 France • *E-mail* : `miebach@cmi.univ-mrs.fr`
 HENRIK STÖTZEL, Fakultät für Mathematik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universitätsstraße 150, D - 44780 Bochum • *E-mail* : `henrik.stoetzel@ruhr-uni-bochum.de`